BLM LIBRARY
88068306

C.F. 9234

W-LM-BLM-12-85

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

# OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

# AUDIT REPORT

AGRICULTURAL TRESPASS
ON PUBLIC LAND

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

**This report may not be disclosed to anyone other than the auditee except by the Assistant Inspector General for Administration, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.**

HD
243
.I2
A375
1986

AUGUST 1986
**DATE**

*Illegal or wasteful activities should be reported to the Office of Inspector General by:*

| *Calling:* | *Sending Written Documents to:* |
|---|---|

WITHIN THE CONTINENTAL U.S.

*Our 24-hour telephone HOTLINE*
800-424-5081
or FTS 343-2424

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General
Post Office Box 57016
Washington, D.C. 20037

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL U.S.

Caribbean Area

809-774-8300
or 809-776-1371

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General
Caribbean Region
P.O. Box 7730
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801

North Pacific Area

671-472-7279
or 671-472-7425

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General
North Pacific Region
238 O'Hara Street
Suite 807, PDN Bldg.
Agana, Guam 96910

South Pacific Area

684-633-1171

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General
South Pacific Region
P.O. Box 370
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

#9036633303 ID 88068306 HD 243 .I2 A375 1986

# United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

August 14, 1986

Memorandum

To: Assistant Secretary - Land and Minerals Management

From: Assistant Inspector General for Audits

Subject: Final Audit Report: "Agricultural Trespass on Public Land, Bureau of Land Management"

This report contains the results of our review of agricultural trespass. The purpose of our review was to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM's) efforts to detect and resolve agricultural trespass. Additionally, this review was a followup to our 1984 report on agricultural trespass on public land in Idaho.

The principal report issues concern BLM's need to:

-- Establish and implement procedures to provide for the systematic identification of trespass by using aerial photography or other remote sensing data, as appropriate.

-- Provide directives that will incorporate trespass identification and resolution into BLM's planning and budgeting systems.

-- Enforce existing requirements for the prompt recording of all suspected trespass.

-- Establish and enforce regulations for substantial assessments for damages for agricultural trespass.

-- Establish procedures for a continuing exchange of information with the U.S. Department of Agriculture concerning the identification of trespass on public land.

In its May 20, 1986, response to our draft report, BLM generally agreed with our findings and four of our five recommendations. Information on these four recommendations (1/1, 1/2, 1/3 and 2/2) provided in BLM's response was sufficiently detailed, but these recommendations have not been implemented. We request that BLM readdress the recommendation it did not agree to, which we have modified, concerning proposing regulations establishing substantial damages for trespass. This is a similar recommendation to the one that BLM agreed to in our 1984 report on agriculture trespass and which it erroneously reported to the Department Followup Official as having been implemented. Accordingly, we will need additional information for all five recommendations, as summarized in Appendix 3.

In accordance with 360 Departmental Manual 5.3, we are requesting your written response to our report findings and recommendations by October 24, 1986. The legislation creating the Office of Inspector General requires semiannual reporting to the Congress on all reports issued, actions taken to implement audit recommendations, and identification of each significant recommendation on which corrective action has not been implemented.

Harold Bloom

Harold Bloom

cc: Director, Bureau of Land Management

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| ACRONYMS AND GLOSSARY | ii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| BACKGROUND | 2 |
| HIGHLIGHTS | 4 |
| EVALUATION OF INTERNAL CONTROLS | 5 |
| FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 7 |
| 1. BLM PRIORITIES REGARDING TRESPASS | 7 |
| 2. TRESPASS RESOLUTION | 15 |
| APPENDIXES | |
| 1. Locations Visited During Our Review and Public Land Administered by State Offices Visited | 20 |
| 2. Summary of Aerial and Remote Sensing Techniques Currently Available | 21 |
| 3. Additional Information Needed to Clear Audit Report from Office of Inspector General Followup System | 22 |

## ACRONYMS AND GLOSSARY

| | |
|---|---|
| BLM | Bureau of Land Management |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| FLPMA | Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 |
| OIG | Office of Inspector General |
| Agriculture | U.S. Department of Agriculture |
| AGRICULTURAL TRESPASS | The unauthorized use or occupancy of national resource lands for the cultivation of crops or the harvesting of native hay by machinery. |
| ORTHOPHOTOQUADS | Aerial photographs, produced by the U.S. Geological Survey, of one quadrangle of land. |
| QUADRANGLE | Area encompassing approximately 48 square miles. |

## INTRODUCTION

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) reviewed agricultural trespass on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The purpose of our review was to evaluate the overall effectiveness of BLM's efforts to detect and resolve agricultural trespass in light of the findings presented in a 1984 OIG report concerning this subject. Our prior report detailed deficiencies in trespass identification and resolution on public land in Idaho.

The review covered by this report included visits to 6 state offices and 10 district offices as shown in Appendix 1. Additionally, Appendix 1 shows that these state offices administer 124.4 million acres of public land.

Our review was made, as applicable, in accordance with the "Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities and Functions," issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests and auditing procedures as were considered necessary under the circumstances.

## BACKGROUND

The primary policies and objectives established for the management of public land are set forth in the "Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976" (FLPMA). Under this Act, the Congress declared that:

> ... it is the policy of the United States that ... the public lands be retained in Federal ownership, unless as a result of the land use planning procedure provided for in this Act, it is determined that disposal of a particular parcel will serve the national interest;

The Act also specifies that public land "... management be on the basis of multiple use and sustained yield ..." and that "... the United States receive fair market value of the use of the public lands unless otherwise provided for by statute."

BLM's responsibilities for the management of public land are set forth in Section 302 of FLPMA which provides, in part, that:

> In managing the public lands the Secretary shall ... regulate, through easements, permits, leases, licenses, published rules, or other instruments as the Secretary deems appropriate, the use, occupancy, and development of the public lands ...

Section 303 of FLPMA prohibits any unauthorized use or occupancy of public land. FLPMA further states that:

> The Secretary shall issue regulations necessary to implement the provisions of this Act with respect to the management, use, and protection of the public lands ... [and that] the use, occupancy, or development of any portion of the public lands contrary to any regulation of the Secretary or other responsible authority, or contrary to any order issued pursuant to any such regulation, is unlawful and prohibited.

We observed and were told by BLM and U.S. Department of Agriculture (Agriculture) officials that the risk of agricultural trespass on public land is often related to the quality of public land and whether it is

contiguous to private land. Agricultural trespass generally occurs where boundary lines are not clearly established or where a farmer can extend farming from private to public land at little additional cost. In this regard, approximately 30 percent of BLM land in the 48 contiguous states is located in California, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana. These 4 states contain 8,900 quadrangles [1/] of BLM land with 4,800 quadrangles abutting private land.

1/ A quadrangle is an area of land encompassing approximately 48 square miles.

## HIGHLIGHTS

BLM has given low priority to preventing, identifying, recording and resolving trespass on public land.

-- BLM has no policies or procedures for systematically identifying the trespass which may be occurring on a "substantial" scale. As a result, BLM has lost potential lease and permit revenues and trespassers have not been discouraged from encroaching on public land.

-- BLM districts have failed to consistently record suspected trespass in accordance with existing BLM directives. As a result, the extent of identified trespass could not be determined or evaluated because trespass records were incomplete.

-- Under existing BLM polices farmers face little risk in trespassing since the fines and other charges normally assessed are less than fees paid for authorized use of the land. In addition some farmers have further benefited by obtaining Agriculture subsidies for the public land on which they trespassed.

-- BLM needs to establish procedures for a continuing exchange of information with Agriculture to prevent the use of public land to obtain agricultural subsidy payments and increase its effectiveness in trespass identification.

## EVALUATION OF INTERNAL CONTROLS

We made a study and evaluation of BLM's system of internal accounting and administrative controls over agricultural trespass to the extent we considered necessary to evaluate the system as required by the "Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities and Functions," issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and to satisfy the audit objectives. We identified significant internal accounting and administrative controls as those controls exercised in the following event cycles (categories) concerning trespass: (1) planning, (2) budgeting, (3) preventing, (4) identifying, (5) recording, and (6) resolving.

The purpose of our study and evaluation was to determine the nature, timing, and extent of the auditing procedures necessary for obtaining reasonable assurance that BLM's internal controls were adequate for (1) detecting and preventing fraud, waste and abuse of Government funds and resources and (2) compliance with applicable laws, regulations, policies, and other directives.

Our study and evaluation made for the limited purposes described above would not necessarily disclose all material weaknesses in the system. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the system of internal accounting and administrative controls of BLM's trespass system taken as a whole. However, our study and evaluation disclosed the following material internal control weaknesses:

1. BLM has no policies or procedures for systematically identifying trespass.

2. BLM districts have not consistently recorded suspected trespass that was identified.

3. BLM has no procedures for preventing or discouraging trespass through assessing administrative costs or interest, or imposing penalties upon trespassers.

4. BLM has not integrated trespass issues into its planning and budgeting systems.

These weaknesses were considered in determining the nature, timing and extent of the audit tests applied in our review. The effects of these weaknesses are addressed in the Findings and Recommendations section of this report. Our recommednations, if implemented, should improve internal controls in these areas.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. BLM PRIORITIES REGARDING TRESPASS

BLM has not effectively implemented existing procedures to identify and stop instances of trespass. Also, known instances of trespass are frequently not recorded as required. In addition sufficient resources to detect and prevent trespass have not been included in BLM plans and budgets. Consequently, potentially significant lease and permit revenues have been lost and the unauthorized use of public land has not been discouraged.

#### Trespass Identification

Although systematic procedures are available for the detection of trespass, BLM has not pursued the identification of trespass on public land in an aggressive or systematic manner.

To obtain an indication of the extent of trespass, we examined 19 aerial photographs of quadrangles of land (48 square miles), from 4,800 quadrangles with common BLM and private borders within the states of California, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana. We identified, as follows, 24 cases of suspected trespass, 18 of which had not been previously noted by BLM.

| State | Quadrangles of Land Examined | No. of Suspected Trespasses Identified | Total Trespass Acreage |
|---|---|---|---|
| California | 5 | 3 | 10.4 |
| Idaho | 5 | 16 | 248.5 |
| Oregon | 4 | 5 | 27.0 |
| Montana | 5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Totals | 19 | 24 | 285.9 |

While our examination was of a small number of quadrangles and not statistically projectable, the results indicate that trespass is occurring

and can be identified using systematic tests and that the frequency of trespass may vary widely between different areas. The lack of attention caused by the low priority given trespass identification is illustrated in the following instances:

-- In one Oregon district, aerial photographs taken in 1970 for a campground identification program were not used by BLM until 1982 to identify 65 cases of suspected trespass totaling an estimated 300 acres. With a lease or permit value between $30 and $50 per acre per year, these trespasses represent potential lost revenues of $9,000 to $15,000 per year. District officials stated that the photographs were not used to identify trespasses earlier because trespass identification and resolution have very low priority.

-- In Nevada, we scanned two districts and identified four cases of suspected trespass. In the process of verifying these at the local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service offices, we discovered one additional trespass from Agriculture aerial photographs. These five suspected trespasses involve approximately 36 acres and could potentially provide $1,800 per year in lease or permit revenues.

-- In California, we were told about an apparent, but unrecorded trespass on a parcel of 80 acres near a metropolitan area. At our request, district officials visited this supposedly vacant tract and found that the 80 acres contained five houses and a number of orchards and cultivated fields. During their visit, district officials also identified an additional 80 acres of public land being used as irrigated pasture. The failure to detect these trespasses, which obviously had occurred over an extended period, is an indication of the low priority given trespass identification.

We commented on the lack of systematic trespass identification procedures in our 1984 report entitled: "Review of Selected Activities of the Bureau of Land Management's Idaho State Office." We recommended that BLM establish a program that would require district personnel to periodically

identify (e.g., on a 2 or 3-year cyclical basis) cases of existing trespass through the use of recent aerial photographs.

In its response to our report, BLM stated:

> BLM agrees with the periodic identification (inventory) of agricultural trespass. However, it believes that complete reliance on aerial photography is too restrictive and frequently expensive. In order to accomplish the intent of the recommendation, the BLM will utilize aerial photographs as well as orthophoto quads, land satellite imagery, student conservation association workers, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service low level photography and any other cost effective means to identify and monitor agricultural trespass.

Although this response gives recognition to the use of systematic procedures including aerial photographs and field reconnaissance as direct detection methods, a systematic identification plan has not been established. Rather, BLM continues to rely on unplanned observations by field personnel and the general public to identify trespass.

In a 1980 memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of BLM, while commenting on the problems of enforcing BLM's trespass policy, stated that "... field employees are far too thinly spread to detect all unauthorized use." Considering that many BLM borders are not well marked and are in remote and dispersed locations, we believe that aerial photography is currently the most effective way to systematically identify suspected trespasses.

In addition to photographing quadrangles of land, other aerial identification techniques are available for use in systematically identifying trespass as discussed in Appendix 2. Although BLM officials agreed that these and other techniques are capable of being used for effective trespass identification, they did not believe that trespass identification warranted the cost of the systematic use of aerial photography. However, as discussed in Appendix 2, much of the aerial data is already available and can be obtained at little or no cost.

In view of the extent of trespass indicated by our review, we believe that BLM needs to establish and implement systematic procedures for identifying trespass, using the most effective aerial photographic or remote sensing techniques feasible. The function of trespass identification has not been integrated with other programs in BLM's planning and budgeting systems. Consequently, specific funding is generally not provided for the detection and resolution of trespass.

In a December 24, 1980, policy statement concerning "Control of Unauthorized Use on Public Lands," the Secretary of the Interior stated that:

> ... the prevention and abatement program [developed as a result of this policy statement] must be fully integrated with BLM's planning system and resource management programs. Such a program must include, among other things, improved public education and involvement to gain public support; more visible identification of public-land boundaries to reduce inadvertent unauthorized uses; faster, more efficient processing of use-authorization requests; improved detection and documentation; and streamlined abatement procedures.

Notwithstanding the above, BLM Manual Section 1616 for preparing these plans provides that:

> Screening eliminates from further planning consideration items which: ... Represent unrelated administrative problems (e.g., unauthorized uses [trespass] or noncompliance with stipulations).

These provisions discourage the development of a systematic program which will integrate trespass issues into the planning system as anticipated in the Secretarial policy statement. This condition was reflected in the response to our Idaho Report where BLM stated that:

> While we agree with the findings and recommendations with regard to agricultural trespass, we again caution that priority assignments, available funding, and work month allocations have not allowed the Bureau of Land Management to initiate and carry out the intensity of effort needed to alleviate trespass, in all of its forms, from occurring on the public lands.

The condition still persists because BLM has not implemented a trespass identification program as recommended in our prior report. BLM needs to include the resources needed for trespass identification and resolution in its planning and budgeting systems.

Recording Trespass

Another indication of the low priority assigned to trespass activities, is the lack of recordkeeping by field personnel of suspected trespass. The BLM Manual specifies, in Section 9234.22, that "When suspected agricultural trespass is observed or reported, promptly complete and submit an Initial Report of Trespass." Section 9230.21, the general instructions for filling out the trespass register, requires that each suspected trespass, whether verified or not, be entered as soon as possible after the Initial Report of Trespass is received. Contrary to the provisions of the BLM Manual, suspected trespasses are often not recorded, as indicated by the following examples:

-- In one Oregon district, 101 cases covering over 800 acres of suspected trespass were not recorded in the trespass register. Sixty-eight of these cases, totaling about 650 acres, had been previously discussed in a Resource Management Plan.

-- Another district in Oregon officially recorded trespasses only when cases were developed to the point necessary to prove the trespass and virtually assure that resolution would promptly follow. Each resource area in this district maintained informal records of suspected trespasses. Our review of these informal records for two resource areas disclosed 26 apparently open cases of suspected trespass, some of which were identified as early as 1974.

-- One district office in Nevada issued an instruction memorandum in April 1985 stating that trespasses should be recorded only after the unauthorized use is "clearly established." This is contrary to the BLM Manual which requires that suspected trespasses, whether verified or not, be recorded.

-- In one Utah district, one resource area promptly recorded trespasses in the trespass register while another resource area never used a trespass register.

-- In one Montana district, no trespasses had been recorded in the trespass register since 1980. However, the files contain evidence of seven cases of trespass that were recently identified by the district or Agriculture involving an aggregate of 155 acres.

As reasons for not recording suspected trespass, district officials cited: (1) concern that the Statute of Limitations would expire before resolution, (2) the futility of filling out forms and reports for potential enforcement which frequently did not materialize, (3) the duplication of effort required when a land case file is subsequently established, and (4) concern about devoting scarce resources toward high expense/low return trespass cases.

Notwithstanding these concerns, BLM needs to ensure that all identified trespasses are recorded. This, in turn, would provide a data base for determining the extent of trespass and provide a basis for establishing priorities and allocating resources.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Director, BLM:

1. Establish and implement procedures that provide for the systematic identification of trespass by using aerial photography or other remote sensing data, as appropriate.

2. Obtain sufficient resources through BLM's planning and budgeting systems for trespass identification and resolution.

3. Enforce existing requirements for the prompt recording of all suspected trespass.

BLM Responses

Recommendation 1

To accomplish the intent of the recommendation, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will use aerial photographs, orthophoto quads, land satellite imagery, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) information, low level photography and any other cost-effective means available for the identification of agricultural trespass.

The BLM, within budget limitations, will use BLM personnel, citizen volunteers, student workers, re-employed annuitants, part-time employees and any other cost-effective personnel means to identify and record agricultural and occupancy trespass.

The BLM will begin to resolve unauthorized agricultural use by temporarily authorizing use, on a short-term or interim basis, through land use permits issued under 43 CFR 2920. The authorization will continue and rentals be received until such time as the BLM determines that: (1) the use may continue for a longer term under a lease (43 CFR 2920), (2) the use should be terminated, or (3) the lands may be sold to the occupant or other interested purchaser.

By July 11, 1986, the Office of the BLM Director will issue instructions and guidance to all BLM field offices for the development and implementation of public affairs, and trespass inventory and resolution action plans. The planned implementation date for these action plans is October 1, 1986.

Recommendation 2

Planning. The Supplemental Program Guidance for planning will be amended to incorporate agricultural and occupancy trespass (identification/resolution) into appropriate portions of the planning manuals (BLM Manuals 1620-1632). Revision and consolidation of the planning manual guidance is scheduled to occur during fiscal year (FY) 1986.

Budgeting. The emphasis on resolving unauthorized use of public lands has increased over 50 percent from FY 1982 to FY 1987.

Real accomplishments have increased from approximately 300 cases closed in FY 1982 to 1,117 cases closed in FY 1985 (unauthorized use and title resolution).

Priority for funding has been identified in program planning packages for future fiscal years. Our Annual Work Plan Directives identify unauthorized use as a priority workload item that must be funded and accomplished.

Recommendation 3

Guidance for implementation of this recommendation will be included in our July 11, 1986, directive to BLM field offices on preparation and execution of trespass abatement action plans; State Directors' held accountable.

OIG Comments

All recommendations are considered resolved based on the comments provided.

## 2. TRESPASS RESOLUTION

Although BLM agreed in its response to our prior report to propose and sponsor regulations to assess fines and penalties against trespassers, such action has not been taken. Hence, BLM has no means of readily imposing penalties for willful trespass or recovering related interest and administrative costs. In addition some farmers have not only committed trespass thereby avoiding user charges, but have also received substantial subsidies from the U.S. Department of Agriculture for using BLM-owned land.

BLM polices have resulted in higher costs for obtaining a permit for authorized land use than paying the existing penalties for trespass if caught. No provisions are available for raising the penalty for trespass to the point where it will exceed the cost of obtaining a land use authorization. Hence, a farmer is better off financially by trespassing and paying the amount determined under current trespass provisions than in obtaining an official use authorization.

For example, one farmer was charged an administrative fee of $826 for issuance of a use permit, plus an annual use fee of $183 based on fair market lease value. If the farmer had trespassed on the same land, and been caught, then based on resolution of prior trespasses, BLM would charge the permit value of $183 per year but not the administrative charges. Consequently, by trespassing, the farmer could have saved $826 if caught and $1,009 if not caught.

Such situations serve to increase the likelihood of trespass by discouraging the public from voluntarily obtaining use authorizations. This is the same issue addressed in our prior report where we recommended that interest and administrative costs be included in the amounts due the Government for trespass. In response to our report, BLM stated:

> Basically, we are proposing a charge of twice the fair market value for nonwillful trespass and three times the fair market value for willful trespass. In addition we are proposing the trespasser be responsible for any restoration or rehabilitation costs incurred.

As of March 1986, these proposed regulations had not been published in the Federal Register even though in its response, BLM had indicated a December 1984 publication date. Ironically, rather than being charged interest or other penalties, some farmer/trespassers have received agricultural subsidies from the Government (through Agriculture). As examples:

-- In a California trespass case detected by BLM on October 2, 1984, a corporate farm received approximately $52,000 in crop support payments from Agriculture. These payments covered the period 1981 through 1983 and were related to approximately 630 acres of BLM land. As of August 1985, the trespass had not been resolved.

-- In another California case in which the trespass had existed since 1971 and was reported by BLM in February 1981, a corporate farm received approximately $34,000 in Agriculture support payments on approximately 280 acres of BLM land during the period 1982 through 1985.

-- In Montana, a farmer, trespassing on 68 acres of BLM land (reported by BLM in May 1985), was paid $2,980 in Agriculture support payments for the period 1981 through 1985.

-- On a 47-acre trespass, which we identified in Idaho, a farmer received $2,148 in Agriculture support payments in 1984. These payments included $84 an acre for not farming 11 acres, under a land set-aside program, and $34 an acre in price support for the 36 acres.

We provided information on the above and other similar trespass cases to our investigative officials. However, to protect the interests of the Government, as a whole, and to possibly avoid duplication of effort in identifying improper subsidies and related trespasses, BLM needs to

establish procedures for a continuing exchange of information with Agriculture.

Also, to enhance the resolution of existing trespass cases and deter future trespass, BLM needs to establish and enforce regulations which provide for assessments for damages which exceed the amount the trespasser would have paid if a use authorization had been obtained.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Director, BLM:

1. Establish and enforce regulations which provide for double damages (i.e., twice the amount the trespasser would have paid for administrative costs and the permit value) for nonwillful trespass, triple damages for willful trespass, and related interest. The regulations should also provide for the recovery of restoration or rehabilitation costs incurred by the Government.

2. Issue guidance to field offices to establish procedures for a continuing exchange of information with Agriculture concerning the identification of trespass on public land.

BLM Responses

Recommendation 1

We have determined in cooperation with the Department's Office of the Solicitor that the BLM has adequate extant authority to initiate an aggressive program for the resolution of unauthorized use and occupancy. This authority is derived from Sections 303(a) and 303(g) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), as well as the regulations contained in 43 CFR 2920 (promulgated under the authority of Section 302(b) of FLPMA). The relevant portions of these authorities provide:

> (a) 303(a) "The Secretary shall issue regulations necessary to implement the provisions of this Act with respect to the management, use and protection of the public lands . . . . Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any such regulation . . . shall be fined no more that $1,000 or imprisoned no more than 12 months or both (emphasis added). Any person charged with a violation of such regulation may be tried and sentenced by any United States magistrate designated for that purpose . . . ."

(b) 303(g) "The use, occupancy, or development of any portion of the public lands contrary to any regulation of the Secretary . . . is unlawful and prohibited (emphasis added).

(c) 43 CFR 2920.1 provides authority for use of public lands for residential, agricultural, industrial and commercial uses via permit, lease or easement.

Since public land use and occupancy regulations require a lease, permit or easement, use and occupancy without such permit, easement, or lease is considered contrary to regulations at 43 CFR 2920 and therefore is unlawful and prohibited.

We will work with the Office of the Solicitor in guiding our field offices on implementation of this authority and use of U.S. magistrates. We expect that guidance will be included in our July 11, 1986, instructions to the field.

Recommendation 2

In coordination with the ASCS, we will provide guidance on the implementation of this recommendation (inclusion in trespass abatement action plans) in our July 11, 1986, instructions to the field.

OIG Comments

We have revised recommendation one to provide specific details on the regulatory changes needed. We have not questioned BLM's authority to deal aggressively with trespass, and we recognize that the FLPMA provides for a fine and imprisonment for violations. However, the current system is cumbersome and the $1,000 limit on fines is often less than the amount the trespasser would have paid for obtaining land use authorization. Assessments for trespass are seldom imposed. In the few instances that assessments are imposed, they are pursued on an individual case basis through civil litigation, a costly and time-consuming process.

BLM needs readily enforceable regulations for effectively dealing with trespass and detering future trespass. As mentioned previously, BLM, in response to our prior report, had agreed to propose such regulations and established a target publication date of December 1984. However, the regulations (which are required by Section 303(a) of FLPMA) have not been issued. Accordingly, we believe that our recommendation is valid in terms of the need for regulations which will identify what charges will be

imposed for both willful and nonwillful trespasses. Paramount in the new regulations that BLM needs to promulgate should be provisions for the assessment of civil damages that are substantially greater than the normal fees charged for authorized land use. We are, therefore, requesting BLM to reconsider our recommendation and provide a target date for publishing the subject regulations for comments (in the Federal Register) and identify the official responsible for implementation.

Recommendation 2 is resolved based on the comments provided.

APPENDIX 1

## LOCATIONS VISITED DURING OUR REVIEW AND PUBLIC LAND ADMINISTERED BY STATE OFFICES VISITED

| | Acres of Public Land |
|---|---|
| California State Office | 18,002,000 |
| Bakersfield District | |
| Idaho State Office | 11,907,000 |
| Boise District | |
| Montana State Office | 8,125,000 |
| Miles City District | |
| Nevada State Office | 48,281,000 |
| Carson District | |
| Elko District | |
| Oregon State Office | 16,007,000 |
| Prineville District | |
| Vale District | |
| Medford District | |
| Utah State Office | 22,076,000 |
| Salt Lake District | |
| Cedar City District | |
| Total | 124,398,000 |

APPENDIX 2

## SUMMARY OF AERIAL AND REMOTE SENSING TECHNIQUES CURRENTLY AVAILABLE

### NATIONAL HIGH ALTITUDE PHOTOGRAPHS (NHAP)

Black and White (B&W) and Color Infrared (CIR) photographs

DESCRIPTION: Products range from a basic 9" x 9" print to a rectified print enlarged to the same scale as the standard BLM base map for resource data collection. Both the B&W and CIR photographs provide good visual contrast to identify cultivated areas, although the CIR photographs are superior for highlighting water and irrigated land.

USAGE: The enlarged, rectified photographs could be used directly with land ownership information developed as part of BLM's planning process.

### LANDSAT IMAGERY

DESCRIPTION: Data produced by NASA from satellite observations which can be used to either depict land scenes graphically or generate computer printouts of selected data.

USAGE: Landsat data is available year-round on an 18-day cycle and can be acquired on magnetic tape through the U.S. Geological Survey Earth Resources Observation System Data Center. Before Landsat can be utilized, extensive development work would be necessary to convert land ownership data into digital form, and to classify the Landsat data to identify desired ground features.

### USDA SLIDES

DESCRIPTION: These aerial photographic slides are high resolution and are produced annually to monitor crop acreage. The slides cover virtually all crop land in the continental U.S. on a county-by-county basis.

USAGE: Slides are maintained and available at USDA county offices. Prior year slides are available at no cost to other Federal agencies.

APPENDIX 3

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED TO CLEAR AUDIT REPORT FROM OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL FOLLOWUP SYSTEM

For each recommendation shown below, provide documentation that the action has been taken or provide a plan for completing the action.

| Finding/Recommendation Reference | Status | Actions Required |
|---|---|---|
| 1/1 | Resolved | Provide a copy of the instructions and guidance for establishing a systematic approach to trespass identification and resolution and identify the official responsible for implementation. |
| 1/2 | Resolved | Provide copies of the Supplemental Program Guidance for planning and the annual work plan directives which identify unauthorized use as a priority item. |
| 1/3 | Resolved | Provide copies of the instructions and guidance to document implementation. |
| 2/1 | Unresolved | Reconsider the revised recommendation and provide target date for publishing subject regulations in the Federal Register for comments and identify the official responsible for implementation. |
| 2/2 | Resolved | Provide copies of the instructions and guidance to document implementation. |